

App. No. 10/607,828
Amcndmnt Dated _____
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-26 remain in this application for further review. Claims 4-13, 17 and 18 are original claims. Claims 2, 3, 14-16, 22-23, and 25-26 were previously presented. Claims 1, 19, 20, 21 and 24 are currently amended. No new matter has been added.

I. Examiner Interview Conducted April 1, 2005

Applicants' attorney held an interview with Examiner Cao on April 1, 2005. Attorney for applicants believes that an agreement was reached with regard to language that distinguishes the prior art of record. Independent claims 1, 19, 20, 21 and 24 have been amended as set forth herein in hopes of properly reflecting the April 1, 2005 Interview. Claim 26 is believed to distinguish the prior art as it stands.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-26 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,758,689 issued to Bair et al. ("Bair"). Applicants have amended claims 1, 19, 20, 21 and 24 in light of the April 1, 2005 interview in order to clarify the claims.

Along with other elements of claim 1, claim 1 clearly distinguishes the Bair reference as follows:

"a pass-through interface body that is configured to enclose the pass-through interface device, wherein *the pass-through interface device includes a first port and a second port, wherein the first port is in electrical communication with the second port*" (emphasis added).

App. No. 10/607,828

Amendment Dated

Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2005

Along with other elements of claim 19, claim 19 clearly distinguishes the Bair reference as follows:

"a first means for enclosing that is arranged to enclose the pass-through interface device, *wherein the pass-through interface device includes a first port and a second port, wherein the first port is in electrical communication with the second port*" (emphasis added).

Along with other elements of claim 20, claim 20 clearly distinguishes the Bair reference as follows:

"providing a pass-through interface device *including a first port and a second port, wherein the first port is in electrical communication with the second port*" (emphasis added).

Along with other elements of claim 21, claim 21 clearly distinguishes the Bair reference as follows:

"a pass-through interface body that is configured to enclose the pass-through interface device, *wherein the pass-through interface device includes a first port and a second port, wherein the first port is in electrical communication with the second port*" (emphasis added).

Along with other elements of claim 24, claim 24 clearly distinguishes the Bair reference as follows:

"a first means for enclosing that is arranged to enclose the pass-through interface device, *wherein the pass-through interface device includes a first port and a second port, wherein the first port is in electrical communication with the second port*" (emphasis added).

Along with other elements of claim 26, claim 26 clearly distinguishes the Bair reference as follows:

App. No. 10/607,828

Amendment Dated

Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2005

"a first port in the pass-through interface body, wherein the first port is arranged for operative engagement with the primary electronic device" (emphasis added).

"a second port in the pass-through interface body, wherein the first port is in operative communication with the second port, and wherein the second port is arranged for operative engagement with the secondary electronic device" (emphasis added).

"a blocking member that is coupled to at least one of the pass-through interface body and the antenna housing, wherein the blocking member is arranged to cover the second port when the secondary electronic device is disengaged from the second port" (emphasis added).

The Bair reference does not teach or otherwise suggest all of the aforementioned limitations. Instead, Bair teaches a "wireless adapter having a connector and a loop antenna in which the loop antenna is foldable, to surround the sides and front face of the connector and thereby protect the connector when the connector is disconnected from the host device." See *Bair* at col. 1, lines 53-57. Succinctly stated, Bair does not teach any structure that would allow an auxiliary device to be connected to the adapter, and Bair fails to teach the blocking member and steps for using the blocking member as set forth in applicants' claims 1, 19-20, 21, 24 and 26. Accordingly, Bair does not anticipate claims 1, 19-20, 21, 24 or 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 2-18, 22-23, and 25 include elements that are not taught or otherwise suggested by the Bair reference. Moreover, claims 2-18, 22-23, and 25 ultimately depended from independent claims 1, 21, and 24, respectively. Claims 1, 21 and 24 are clearly allowable for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, applicants believe that claims 2-18, 22-23, and 25 are allowable for at least those same reasons.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is

App. No. 10/607,828
Amendment Dated _____
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2005

respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Ryan T. Grace
Registration No. 52,956
Direct Dial: 206.342.6258

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

